



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,096	09/30/2003	David W. McKnight	16112RRUS01U (NORT10-0034)	4806
33000	7590	01/03/2006	EXAMINER	
DOCKET CLERK P.O. DRAWER 800889 DALLAS, TX 75380			RAMAKRISHNAIAH, MELUR	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2643	

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/675,096	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MCKNIGHT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Melur Ramakrishnaiah	<b>Art Unit</b> 2643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2-4-05, 2-14-05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-7, 8-14, 15-21, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Detampel, Jr. et al. (US 2001/0002927, hereinafter Detampel) in view of Susen et al. (WO 00/14730, hereinafter Susen).

Regarding claim 1, Detampel discloses for call conferencing, comprising: detecting first access to a conference bridge operable to support a conference call, receiving a first pass code from the first access, and securing the conference bridge using the pass code received from the first access by allowing a second access to the conference bridge, the second access based at least partially on the pass code from the first access (figs. 1, 4, 6, paragraphs: 0006, 0011-0027, 0052-0054, 0064, 0067-0075)

Regarding claim 8, Detampel discloses an apparatus for call conferencing, comprising: one or more ports operable to receive at least one channel of a plurality of channels for a conference call, and one or more processors (not shown) collectively operable to: detect a first access to a conference bridge operable to support the conference call, receive a first pass code from the first access, and secure the conference bridge using the pass code received from the first access by allowing the second access to the conference bridge, the second access based at least partially on

Art Unit: 2643

the pass code from the first access (figs. 1, 4, 6, paragraphs: 0006, 0011-0027, 0052-0054, 0064, 0067-0075)

Regarding claim 15, Detampel discloses a computer program on a computer readable medium and operable to be executed by a processor, the computer program comprising computer readable program code for: detecting a first access to a conference bridge operable to support a conference call, receiving a first pass code from the first access, and securing the conference bridge using the pass code received from the first access by allowing a second access to the conference bridge, the second access based at least partially on the pass code from the first access (figs. 1, 4, 6, paragraphs: 0006, 0011-0027, 0052-0054, 0064, 0067-0075)

Detampel differs from claims 1, 8, and 15 in that he does not explicitly teach the following: allowing a second access to continue after the conference call begins based at least partially on a second pass code, wherein the second pass code may or may not equal the first pass code.

However, Susen discloses method for checking access authorization which teaches the following: allowing a second access to continue after the conference call (reads on conversation taking place between users of the telephones) begins based at least partially on a second pass code, wherein the second pass code may or may not equal the first pass code (see abstract).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Detampel's system to provide for the following: allowing a

Art Unit: 2643

second access to continue after the conference call begins based at least partially on a second pass code, wherein the second pass code may or may not equal the first pass code as this arrangement would facilitate verifying the participants are bona-fide participants to the telecommunication system after the call is established so that this would deter in misuse of the communication system by others who are not authorized to use the system as taught by Susen.

Regarding claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-21, Detampel further teaches the following wherein the second pass code (reads on PIN, see fig. 6) does not equal the first pass code, receiving the second pass code (reads on PIN, see fig. 6) from the first access during the conference call, prompting a participant to identify whether the conference bridge, receiving the first pass code in response to the participant indicating that the conference bridge is to be secured, second access is based at least partially on the pass code from the first access when the conference bridge is secured, identifying the first access as being associated with a chairperson , prompting the participant for the first pass code, receiving an identification of one or more depressed numeric buttons on a communication device associated with the participant and determining whether the one or more identified numeric buttons represents the numeric sequence associated with the first pass code, and wherein receiving the pass code from the first access in response to determining that the first access is associated with the chairperson, the one or more processors (not shown) are further collectively operable to allow the second access to continue based at least partially on at least one of the first pass code and a second pass code, one or more processors are further operable to receive the second

Art Unit: 2643

pass code from the first access , prompting a participant to identify whether the conference bridge is to be secured (this step is implicit as the conference scheduler is providing pass code), receiving the pass code in response to the participant indicating that the conference bridge is to be secured, second access is based at least partially on the pass code from the the first access when the conference bridge is secured, one or more processors (not shown) are further collectively operable to authenticate first and second access (figs. 1, 4, 6, paragraphs: 0006, 0011-0027, 0052-0054, 0064, 0067-0075).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Regarding claims 3, 10, and 17, Applicant argues that claims 3, 10, and 17 recite that the second pass code is received "from the first access during the conference call" Detampel simply recites that a subscriber may provide a PIN before a conference call is established. Detampel lacks any mention of ... a different PIN during a conference call". Regarding this, contrary to applicant's interpretation of the reference, Detampel teaches user providing a second pass code (reads on PIN) which is received beforehand during first access in connection with conference (fig. 6). Therefore, Detampel teaches the limitation of claims 3, 10 and 17.

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2643

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melur Ramakrishnaiah whose telephone number is (571)272-8098. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 Hr schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curt Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2643

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Melur Ramakrishnaiah  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2643